

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 484

UD 018 031

TITLE ESEA Title I Annual Evaluation Report, FY 1977.
INSTITUTION South Carolina State Dept. of Education, Columbia.
Office of Federal Programs.
SPONS AGENCY South Carolina State Dept. of Education, Columbia.
Div. of Instruction.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 46p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; *Compensatory Education Programs;
Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs;
Mathematics; *Program Descriptions; *Program
Evaluation; Reading
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *South
Carolina

ABSTRACT

In the state of South Carolina during fiscal year 1977 Title I instructional activities served 127,702 children, 929 of whom were not public school children. The children came predominantly from grades one to six, with the next highest concentration from grades seven to nine. Reading activities were provided for 65% of Title I students and math activities for 50%. Dropout prevention activities involved 5% of Title I students. Data supplied by the Statewide Testing Program revealed that the average grade equivalents of South Carolina students were below national norms at all grade levels tested. Results indicate that Title I reading and math activities which served elementary level students were effective. The elementary grade level participants showed achievement gains which statistically significantly exceeded what would be expected of nonparticipants. The overall gain for all grades was also judged to be significant. The gains in math appeared to be slightly greater than those in reading. Title I efforts to prevent the dropout rate were judged to be successful. (Author/AM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED151484

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ESEA TITLE I ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FY 1977

Prepared by

The Office of Federal Programs
Sidney B. Cooper, Jr., Director
Garlin A. Hicks, Chief Supervisor, Allocation Section

UDO18031

South Carolina Department of Education
Cyril B. Busbee, State Superintendent
Division of Instruction
Charlie G. Williams, Deputy Superintendent

Columbia, South Carolina
November 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE A-1	vii
CTBS Battery Total Expected and Obtained Mean Grade Equivalents (SGE) and National Percentile Ranks for All Students and Title I Students in Grades 4, 7 and 11 (October, 1975)	
I. BASIC STATISTICS	1
TABLE I-1	2
Number of Students Served By Title I From FY 1971 Through FY 1977	
TABLE I-2	2
Unduplicated Count of the Number of Students Actually Participating in Title I Activities	
TABLE I-3	4
Title I Participants and Expenditures for Reading, Math and Dropout Prevention Activities	
TABLE I-4	5
Percentage of Expenditures by Type of Service	
TABLE I-5	5
Budgeted Funds by Type of Service	
TABLE I-6	6
Number and Percentage of Personnel Employed by Special Classification	
TABLE I-7	7
Total Number Personnel Employed by Title I Funds	
II. STATE AGENCY STAFF VISITS AND MONITORING PROCEDURES	8
III. PROGRAM INFORMATION	9
TABLE III-1	10
FY 1977 Estimated Fund Expenditures and Number of Student Participants for Title I Regular and Summer School by Instructional and Supportive Service Category (Duplicated Count)	

	Page
TABLE III-2 Number of Districts Indicating Specific Problems Encountered When Initiating and Implementing a Title I Project	11
TABLE III-3 Characteristics of Title I Instructional Programs	13
TABLE III-4 Pre-Service, In-Service and Planning Time for Title I Staffs	14
TABLE III-5 Criteria Used for Selecting Students for Title I Programs	14
IV. NEEDS ASSESSMENT	15
TABLE IV-1 National Percentile Ranks for Mean Grade Equivalents (SGE) for All Students and Title I Students in Grades 4, 7 and 11 for Selected CTBS Subtests (October, 1975)	18
V. EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS	19
TABLE V-1 Norm-Referenced Model Achievement Data By Test, Total Reading	22
TABLE V-2 Norm-Referenced Model Achievement Data By Test, Total Math	22
TABLE V-3 Norm-Referenced Model Achievement Data By Grade, Total Reading	24
TABLE V-4 Norm-Referenced Model Achievement Data By Grade, Total Math	24
VI. COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	27
TABLE VI-1 Membership of Parent Advisory Councils	28
TABLE VI-2 Activities in Which the Parent Advisory Councils Participated	28
TABLE VI-3 Frequency of PAC Meetings	29

	Page
VII. DISSEMINATION	31
TABLE VII-1	32
LEA Techniques Used in Dissemination of Information and Frequency of Use	
VIII. TEACHER/TEACHER AIDE TRAINING	36
IX. COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN ENROLLED IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS	37
X. STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE EFFORTS	38

ABSTRACT

Participants

Title I instructional activities served 127,702 children during FY 1977. Of this number, 929 were non-public school children. The participants came predominantly from grades one to six (77,005), with the next highest concentration being in grades seven to nine (26,726).

Funds

The FY 1977 allocation to South Carolina was \$33,999,697. Of this allocation, \$30,969,347 was budgeted during FY 1977 in approved project applications for local school districts. Seventy-two percent (72%) of the budgeted amount was spent for salaries, paying a total of 3,855 personnel in the winter and 334 in the summer. The largest single group of personnel was teacher aides (1,962).

Program Description

Reading activities were provided for 65% of Title I students and math activities for 50%. Dropout prevention activities involved 5% of Title I participants.

An estimated average of \$5,621 per district was spent for pre-service and in-service; of this amount, an average of \$2,094 per district came from Title I funds and the remainder from other sources. Twenty-five hours was the average total time each staff member participated in pre-service and/or in-service. The Title I staff had an average of twenty-three hours paid planning time during the summer and five hours per week during

the winter. The instructional activities offered typically were organized as a special class staffed by a certificated teacher and a full-time aide. Students were regularly scheduled to the class for approximately five hours per week. Typically, the Title I teacher planned the students' instruction and a commercially published curriculum package and/or locally developed materials were utilized.

LEAs reported that the problems encountered most frequently in administering Title I programs were:

1. Limitations imposed by federal and state regulations and guidelines
2. Inadequate Title I funds
3. Lack of school facilities or space for carrying out the project
4. Excessive paper work

Needs Assessment

Data supplied by the Statewide Testing Program reveal clearly that the average grade equivalents of South Carolina students are below national norms at all grade levels tested. National percentile ranks indicate that the state's fourth graders perform somewhat more poorly than the students in the other two tested grades. Title I students in the eleventh grade perform relatively worse than those in the fourth and seventh (See Table A-1).

Results of Testing

Test data from five standardized test batteries were compiled. The data represented 50,004 Title I reading activity participants and 39,562 students participating in math activities. The compilation was made by test battery and also by grade level.

TABLE A-1

CTBS BATTERY TOTAL EXPECTED AND OBTAINED
MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENTS (SGE) AND NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS
FOR ALL STUDENTS AND TITLE I STUDENTS IN
GRADES 4, 7 and 11 (OCTOBER, 1975)

GRADE	EXPECTED SGE	EXPECTED PR	OBTAINED SGE (ALL)	OBTAINED PR (ALL)	OBTAINED SGE(TITLE I)	OBTAINED PR(TITLE I)
4	4.1	50	3.4	33	2.6	12
7	7.1	50	6.1	38	3.9	12
11	11.1	50	10.0	36	5.8	7

The data were analyzed within the structure of a norm-referenced evaluation model. The results indicate that Title I reading and math activities which serve elementary level students are effective. The elementary grade level participants showed achievement gains which statistically significantly exceeded what would be expected of non-participants. The overall gain for all grades was judged to be significant also. The gains in math appear to be slightly greater than those in reading.

Dropouts

A total of 6,468 dropout-prone students were served by Title I dropout prevention activities. Of these participants, 4.2% dropped out of school during the year. The state dropout rate for the past three years has averaged 1.2%. In view of the fact that these Title I dropout prevention programs serve only those students who are judged to be most likely to drop out of school, the programs are considered to have been successful.

I. Basic Statistics

A. Number of LEAs participating in Title I

1. Regular school term only	<u>81</u>
2. Both regular and summer terms	<u>11</u>
3. Total	<u>92</u>

B. Unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs

1. Enrolled in public schools	<u>126,773</u>
2. Enrolled in non-public schools	<u>929</u>
3. Total	<u>127,702</u>

C. Title I joint projects

1. Number of projects	<u>3</u>
2. Number of districts participating	<u>35</u>

The total number of South Carolina children served by Title I began to decline after FY 1973. The number in FY 1974 was apparently anomalously small because of the uncertainty of the funding level which resulted from an impounding of funds at the federal level. Except for that year and for FY 1976 in which there was a slight increase, the trend has been downward and would seem to indicate an increasing effort to concentrate Title I services upon the children who are the most educationally deprived. The numbers of students served by Title I programs in South Carolina for the past five years are shown in Table I-1.

In keeping with the state philosophy, which emphasizes preventive rather than remedial education, there are proportionally more students enrolled in Title I programs at the elementary than at the secondary level. The data in Table I-2 show the high concentration in grades one through six and the low concentration in grades ten through twelve.

Table I-1

Number of Students Served by Title I From FY 1973 Through FY 1977

Year	Number Served
FY 1973	152,613
FY 1974	121,368
FY 1975	135,420
FY 1976	136,169
FY 1977	127,702

Table I-2

Unduplicated Count Of The Number of Students
Actually Participating In Title I Activities

<u>Regular Term</u>			
Grade Levels	Public Schools	Private Schools	Total
Kindergarten	2,192	174	2,366
1-3	35,277	376	35,653
4-6	39,330	98	39,428
7-9	26,399	66	26,465
10-12	9,393	44	9,437
Special Education	8,888	0	8,888
Other	2,738	126	2,864
Totals	124,217	884	125,101
<u>Summer Term</u>			
Kindergarten	0	0	0
1-3	941	45	986
4-6	938	0	938
7-9	261	0	261
10-12	183	0	183
Special Education	233	0	233
Other	0	0	0
Totals	2,556	45	2,601

The number of pupils participating and the amount of Title I expenditures are presented in Table I-3 and Table I-4. Title I efforts are evidently concentrated on reading.

The data in Table I-4 show that there has been very little change in the percentage of funds expended for instructional, supportive and other services during the period from FY 1973 to FY 1977. However, within the instructional service category there has been a substantial increase (12.6%) in the expenditures for salaries of teachers, aides, etc., while a decrease of 8.0% has occurred in the expenditures for instructional equipment.

Table I-5 shows the budgeted funds by service category for the FY 1973 to FY 1977 period. The total budgeted funds increased during this time by 9.8%

The number and percentage of personnel employed under Title I are given by major classification categories in Table I-6. Almost one-half (47.3%) of those employed served in the capacity of aide. Table I-7 gives a more detailed classification of Title I personnel. The largest number of professional personnel employed in any one category was 906. That category was elementary teacher.

Table I-3

Title I Participants And Expenditures For Reading,
Math, And Dropout Prevention Activities

Regular Term			
Grade Levels	Title I Reading Activity	Title I Math Activity	Title I Dropout Prevention Activity
Kindergarten	1,105	1,041	0
1-3	29,110	17,444	134
4-6	25,795	26,005	248
7-9	17,209	12,116	2,801
10-12	4,534	1,631	3,646
Private	489	354	0
Other	3,197	3,111	0
Total Participants	81,439	61,702	6,829
Total Expenditures	\$15,630,615.70	\$7,539,106.20	\$841,858.16
Average Per Pupil Expenditure	191.93	122.18	123.27
Summer Term			
Kindergarten	0	0	0
1-3	843	714	0
4-6	913	818	4
7-9	157	169	22
10-12	149	24	10
Private	5	5	0
Other	0	0	0
Total Participants	2,067	1,730	36
Total Expenditures	\$ 167,027.34	\$ 77,131.44	\$ 2,235.00
Average Per Pupil Expenditure	80.80	44.58	62.08

Table I-4
Percentage Of Expenditures By Type Of Service

Type of Service	Percentage of Total Expenditures					Change In Percentage
	FY '73	FY '74	FY '75	FY '76	FY '77	FY '73 - '77
Instructional						
Salaries (Teachers, Aides & Other)	59.2	59.4	69.7	71.5	71.8	+12.6
Equipment For Instruction	9.1	10.8	2.8	1.1	1.1	-8.0
Total	68.3	70.2	72.5	72.6	72.9	+4.6
Supportive Services						
Health Services	4.6	4.9	4.1	3.9	3.8	-0.8
Transportation, Food, Construction and Re-modeling, Sites and Other Equipment	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.4	.9	-0.4
Other - Attendance, Student and Community	7.8	4.5	5.4	5.3	5.4	-2.4
Total	13.7	10.9	10.9	10.6	10.1	-3.6
Other Services						
Administration, Operation and Maintenance	8.9	8.6	7.1	7.2	7.2	-1.7
Fixed Charges	9.1	10.3	9.5	9.6	9.9	+0.8
Total	18.0	18.9	16.6	16.8	17.1	-0.9

Table I-5
Budgeted Funds By Type Of Service

Type Of Service	FY '73	FY '74	FY '75	FY '76	FY '77
Instructional Expenditures	19,274,191	14,421,433	19,590,423	20,882,862	22,553,752
Supportive Services	3,858,087	2,235,353	2,938,745	3,050,884	3,126,716
Other	5,078,429	3,880,844	4,508,162	4,831,219	5,288,879
Total	28,210,702	20,537,630	27,037,330	28,764,965	30,969,347

Table I-6

Number And Percentage Of Personnel Employed By
Special Classification

Classification	Regular Term		Summer Term		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Teachers (all grade levels - all subjects)	1,240	32.17	114	34.13	1,354	32.32
Aides (include library aides)	1,890	49.03	93	27.85	1,983	47.34
Other Professionals (librarians, super- visors, counselors, evaluation special- ists, administrators)	574	14.89	34	10.17	608	14.52
Support Staff (clerical, janitors, etc.)	151	3.92	93	27.85	244	5.82
Totals	3,855	100.01	334	100.00	4,189	100.00

Table I-7

Total Number Of Personnel Employed By Title I Funds

Classification	Regular Year	Summer School	Total
Teachers - Pre-Kindergarten	11	0	11
Teachers - Kindergarten	37	8	45
Teachers - Elementary	826	80	906
Teachers - Secondary	273	11	284
Teachers - Special Education	93	15	108
Teacher Aides	1,873	89	1,962
Librarians (Media Specialists)	4	3	7
Library Aides	17	4	21
Supervisors/Administrators	257	26	283
Counselors/Psychologists	40	0	40
Testing Personnel	21	0	21
Attendance/Social Workers	77	0	77
Nurses	96	2	98
Other Medical Personnel	2	0	2
Clerical Personnel	143	20	163
Janitors	6	15	21
Bus Drivers	2	58	60
Other (Substitute Teachers and Evaluators)	77	3	80
Totals	3,855	334	4,189

II. State Agency Staff Visits And Monitoring Procedures

Each project in the state is scheduled for an on-site review by the Title I staff on a rotating two-year cycle. These reviews are one aspect of the total reviewing and monitoring process which begins with the pre-submission of proposed projects in April. The pre-submission process enables the Title I staff of the Office of Federal Programs to schedule individual conferences with each of the state's ninety-two districts and the six state agencies which receive Title I funds. Weaknesses in the proposals are identified and modifications are recommended or stipulated as necessary. This process minimizes the number of changes in the projects which must be made after the official submission date.

The Title I staff begins on-site program reviews in the fall. The major purpose of these reviews is to ensure that program operations are being conducted in accordance with the specifications set forth in the approved project. If a need for corrective action is determined during the initial review, the district is given thirty days to make changes. A follow-up review by the Title I staff is made to validate that the corrective action has been taken. If the Title I staff should find that corrective action has not been taken, funding for the offending district or agency may be terminated.

During fiscal year 1977, forty-seven initial on-site program reviews and twenty-six follow-up reviews were made. There was one post-follow-up review. In addition, accountants from the Office of Finance conducted eighteen comparability reviews. Staff from the U. S. Office of Education, during its annual review, visited eight school districts in South Carolina.

III. Program Information

The data reported in Table III-1 indicate that more students participated in reading activities, both in the regular and in the summer term, than in any other type of instructional activity. Mathematics activities, however, were heavily emphasized also. These facts reflect the state's continuing emphasis on basic skills programs. Medical assistance was the predominant supportive service. Dental and social work services were emphasized also.

Clearly, the most expensive type of instructional activity in terms of cost per student (\$239.16) was pre-kindergarten and kindergarten. The least expensive was English speech (\$32.60). The predominant activity type, reading, cost \$142.65 per student.

The most expensive support service in per student cost (\$117.17) was special services for handicapped. The least expensive was food (\$5.85), but this service was provided only in the summer term. Of the other services, psychological (\$29.55) was the most expensive and guidance counseling (\$8.46) was the least expensive per student.

The LEAs reported encountering various types of problems in implementation of their Title I programs. The types and frequency of occurrence of problems are summarized in Table III-2. The most frequently occurring problems were associated with the limitations imposed by federal and state regulations and guidelines and the inadequacy of Title I funds. A lack of school facilities or space for carrying out the project and excessive paper work were also frequently cited.

A typical Title I activity, whether it be reading or mathematics, is organized as a special class, has regularly scheduled hours each week (the predominant number of hours being five per week), and the students

Table III-1

FY 1977 Estimated Fund Expenditures And Number Of
Student Participants For Title I Regular And Summer School
By Instructional And Supportive Service Category
(Duplicated Count)

Instructional Activities	Number of Students		Estimated Cost		Estimated Cost Per Pupil
	Regular	Summer	Regular	Summer	
English-Reading	76,464	1,737	11,040,783	114,929	142.65
English-Speech	272	-	8,867	-	32.60
English-Other Language Arts	7,827	-	1,246,316	-	159.23
Math	59,680	1,660	5,423,670	49,830	89.23
Other Vocational Education	540	-	81,781	-	151.45
Special Activities for Handicapped	8,511	280	1,196,420	23,175	138.73
Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	2,526	215	639,787	15,755	239.16
Other Instructional Activities	15,015	628	1,864,342	19,988	120.46
Total	170,835	4,520	21,501,966	223,677	123.89
Supportive Services					
Attendance	16,115	-	233,576	-	14.49
Clothing	5,154	-	64,135	-	12.44
Food	-	1,282	-	7,504	5.85
Guidance Counseling	11,532	-	97,586	-	8.46
Health-Dental	26,546	-	237,957	-	8.96
Health-Medical	51,546	230	779,043	2,000	15.09
Library	3,751	-	41,980	-	11.19
Psychological	8,496	-	251,037	-	29.55
Social Work	25,696	-	397,003	-	15.44
Speech Therapy	2,492	-	40,354	-	16.19
Transportation	2,431	1,395	14,530	56,998	18.70
Special Services for Handicapped	115	-	13,474	-	117.17
Other Services	33,643	-	336,605	-	10.01
Total	187,517	2,907	2,507,280	66,492	13.52

Total of Regular School Expenditures for State
Total of Summer School Expenditures for State

\$24,009,246
\$ 290,169

Table III-2

Number of Districts Indicating Specific Problems Encountered
When Initiating And Implementing A Title I Project

Specific Problems*	Number of LEA's Encountering Problem
Limitations imposed by federal and state regulations	41
Inadequate Title I funds	33
Lack of school facilities or space for carrying out this project	25
Excessive paper work	23
Inability to secure equipment, materials and supplies in time	15
Delay of announcement of allocation amounts	14
Delay between submission and approval of project	12
Delay of financial payments	10
Completion of evaluation report	9
Shortage of administrative staff to plan and supervise the project	7
Designing of projects to meet pupil needs	6
Lack of appropriate evaluation devises	6
Development of evaluation strategies	5
Fiscal accounting procedures	5
Inability to obtain qualified staff	4
Delay between submission and approval of amendments	4
Student selection procedures	4
Inadequate planning time	3
Identification of pupil needs	3
Pre-service and/or in-service training of staff	3
Completion of project applications	1
Obtaining desired PAC participation	1

*Twenty-nine districts reported encountering no problems in initiating and implementing their Title I projects.

assignments are planned by the Title I teacher. The curriculum materials used are either commercially published packages or locally developed, with the former slightly predominating. The instructional staff typically consists of a certified teacher and a full-time aide. The number of students per adult is somewhat smaller in mathematics than in reading, but the overall median is something less than fifteen. Table III-3 summarizes the data.

Table III-4 reports data pertaining to pre-service, in-service and planning functions of the Title I staffs. In all, 3335 Title I staff participated in either or both pre-service and in-service activities. The average number of pre-service hours per staff member was approximately eight, while the average in-service hours was approximately seventeen. An average of approximately twenty-three planning hours were scheduled during the summer and approximately five planning hours per week were scheduled for each staff member during the program. The cost of the pre-service and in-service activities was \$517,113.00 of which \$192,645.00 was from Title I funds.

The criteria used in the selection of students for participation in Title I activities varied, but 46.0% of the activities served students who were chosen on the basis of a standardized test score and three or more additional criteria. A standardized test score and two additional criteria were used in 17.2% of the activities and a standardized test score and one additional criterion were used in 23.7% of the activities. Table III-5 reports the number and percentage of activities using various selection criteria.

Table III-3
 Characteristics of Title I
 Instructional Activities

Activity Characteristics	Number of Activities		
	Reading	Math	Total
Type of Instruction			
Special Class	75	60	135
Resource Room	28	12	40
Laboratory	39	22	61
Floating Teacher	4	3	7
Other	32	13	45
Schedule of Instruction			
Flexible schedule	24	19	43
Regularly scheduled hours/weeks	152	99	251
Planning of Instruction			
Planned by regular teacher	43	45	88
Planned by Title I teacher	138	80	218
Planned with assistance of a Title I supervisor	81	48	129
Curriculum Materials Used			
Locally developed	139	75	214
Commercially published package	138	93	231
Supplementary textbooks	53	19	72
Other	59	25	84
Instructional Staff			
Certificated staff only	37	20	57
Certificated staff and full-time aide	103	76	179
Certificated staff and part-time aide	26	18	44
Other	10	8	18
Number of students per adult			
Less than 5	7	2	9
5-14	120	76	196
15 to 24	145	36	181
More than 24	6	6	12
Instructional hours per student per week			
One or less	1	2	3
2 to 4	45	31	76
5	109	83	192
More than 5	22	4	26

Table III-4

Pre-Service, In-Service And Planning Time
For Title I Staffs

Title I expenditures for pre-service and in-service	\$192,644.89
Expenditures from other sources for pre-service and in-service (estimated)	\$324,467.66
Title I staff participating in pre-service or in-service	3,335
Average number of hours scheduled for pre-service per staff member	7.89
Average number of hours scheduled for in-service per staff member	16.72
Average number of hours scheduled for planning during the summer for each Title I staff member	23.24
Average number of hours per week scheduled as planning time for each Title I staff member	4.85

Table III-5

Criteria Used For Selecting Students For
Title I Programs

Criteria	Activities	
	Number	Percent Of Total
Standardized test score only	18	4.9
Standardized test score and one additional criterion	87	23.7
Standardized test score and two additional criteria	63	17.2
Standardized test score and three or more criteria	169	46.0
Other	30	8.2
Total	367	100%

IV. Needs Assessment

The South Carolina State Department of Education adopted in 1970 a five-year plan to increase the educational quality of South Carolina schools. The plan had the following major objectives:

1. To reduce the number of dropouts by at least 50 percent by 1975.
2. To reduce the number of students repeating the first grade from the present 15 percent to a maximum of 5 percent by 1975.
3. To establish a statewide program of public kindergartens available to all 5-year-old children by 1975.
4. To measurably improve the basic verbal and quantitative skills of the inschool students by 1975.
5. To provide an adequate occupational training program for 100 percent of the secondary school students who choose it by 1975.
6. To increase the number of high school graduates entering post high school training to at least 50 percent by 1975.
7. To develop an adequate educational program for youth with physical, mental or emotional handicapping conditions by 1975.
8. To increase the total adult enrollment in basic and high school programs from the present 40,000 to at least 80,000 by 1975.
9. To promote programs to provide adequate and qualified professional and para-professional personnel to staff the state's educational system.
10. To ensure the implementation of at least a defined minimum educational program in each local school district by 1975.
11. To develop and maintain a system of continuous evaluation and upgrading of education

The plan and the objectives have been reviewed and revised yearly and were extended through the 1976-1977 school year.

The State Board of Education mandated that districts in which a need for improving the basic skills areas or for reducing the dropout rate

exists, Title I money must be directed first toward reading, mathematics and dropout prevention programs. In order to implement the mandate, the Title I application includes a needs assessment package which is designed to solicit data related to the reading and mathematics achievement and dropout rate from each district. The data utilized for assessing district needs in relation to the mandated achievement areas are taken from the annual Statewide Testing Program for districts which participate in that program. This procedure allows for consistency in the state and local needs assessment endeavors, and provides a consistent reference point for comparing achievement among districts. The few districts which do not participate in the Statewide Testing Program are required to provide comparable data. The testing plan for October 1975 is summarized below:

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Test(s) and Level</u>	<u>Sample</u>
4	<u>Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form S, Level 1 and Short Form Test of Academic Aptitude, Level 2</u>	96.9% of all public school students and approximately 95% of Catholic school students except those enrolled in special education programs
7	<u>CTBS/S-2</u>	97.7% of all public school students and approximately 93% of Catholic school students except those enrolled in special education programs
11	<u>CTBS/S-4</u>	12.3% identified by a stratified random sampling procedure

Each district receives total district, individual school, and individual pupil reports for both Title I participants and total school populations, and the Office of Federal Programs receives reports aggregated at the state level.

Local Title I coordinators utilize district and school reports for

local needs assessments. If the reading scores of 35 percent or more of the students in a district's priority schools fall at or below the 25th percentile according to national norms, a reading program must be implemented by that district with Title I funds. A similar requirement is imposed for mathematics performance. If fewer than 35 percent of the students score below the 25th percentile in either or both of these instructional areas, a Title I program is not mandated for the area(s) for which this performance level occurs. Nevertheless, every district in the state has a Title I reading activity and only a few districts do not have a mathematics activity.

Data from the Statewide Testing Program, aggregated for the entire state, are presented in Table IV-1. The entries in this table are national percentile ranks corresponding to the average performance of "all" students and Title I students in the 4th, 7th and 11th grades in South Carolina. An examination of the data in this table reveals that South Carolina students tend to score relatively lower in mathematics and reading than in other areas. Further, 4th grade students are systematically scoring relatively more poorly than students in other grades.

The data show also that Title I students tend to score relatively lower in mathematics and reading than in other areas. Fourth graders tend to perform less well in most areas than do seventh graders, and eleventh graders are poorer in performance than the other grades in all areas. Since the Statewide Testing Program is conducted in the fall, several weeks after Title I students have begun their activities, these data also demonstrate that selection procedures are successfully identifying educationally deprived students for Title I participation.

Table IV-1

National Percentile Ranks For Mean Grade Equivalents (SGE)
 For All Students And Title I Students In Grades 4, 7, and 11
 For Selected CTBS Subtests
 (October, 1975)

Students	Grade	Battery Total	Reading Total	Language Total	Math Total	Reference Skills	Science	Social Studies
All	4	33	35	38	33	41	39	39
	7	37	39	40	35	46	44	42
	11	35	37	43	34	45	41	45
Title I	4	12	14	16	13	18	17	19
	7	14	15	16	16	20	20	19
	11	7	8	10	7	14	15	14

V. Evidence of Effectiveness

Reading and Mathematics Achievement

During FY 1974, the Office of Federal Programs, South Carolina State Department of Education, began encouraging the utilization of an evaluation design for Title I instructional activities which is called a norm-referenced model. It is one of the three models which RMC Research Corporation has recommended to the United States Office of Education as alternative methods of evaluating the impact of Title I projects on the achievement of student participants. Use of this model requires the acceptance of a basic assumption. The assumption is that the average post-test performance of a group of students will be at the same normative level as that of the pre-test unless exposure to some special intervention causes the students' achievement to improve. In other words, the expected performance level of students, had they not been exposed to the treatment, is derived from their pre-test performance related to national norms.

As a result of the need for a metric which would permit the aggregation of achievement data across projects and across grade levels, RMC Research Corporation developed also what are called Normal Curve Equivalency Scores (NCEs). These scores are related to percentile ranks (PRs) in that the percentile points 1, 50, and 99 are exactly equivalent, respectively, to NCEs of 1, 50, and 99. At other points, PRs and NCEs do not have equivalent values. One advantage of the NCE scale is that an NCE of a given magnitude represents the same relative performance level whether it is reporting the performance of a third grader in South Carolina or that of a sixth grader in Iowa. Another advantage of the NCEs is that they represent an equal interval scale, e.g., the difference between an NCE of 10 and an NCE of 15 represents, in effect, the same difference

in achievement as is represented by the difference between an NCE of 20 and one of 25. Also, within the structure of the norm-referenced evaluation model, the expected non-treatment post-test average NCE would be the pre-test average NCE for the students who were exposed to the treatment.

The norm-referenced evaluation model specifies certain conditions which should be met in order to permit the drawing of valid conclusions about the probable effect of a special instructional program. Principal among these conditions are the following.

1. The analysis should include only the students for whom both pre- and post-test scores are available.
2. The test forms used for pre- and post-testing should be identical and have an underlying standard score scale which is independent of test form and/or continuous over all levels of the test.
3. The times at which the pre- and post-tests are administered should be within three weeks of the time(s) of the year when the normative data actually were collected.
4. Students who participate in the activity should not be selected on the basis of the pre-test score.

The data included in this report meet the first three of these conditions. The extent to which the fourth condition is met varies among activities and districts. The selection of students for some activities for which data are reported did not utilize the pre-test score. The selection of students for most activities for which data are reported did include the pre-test score. As far as can be determined, however, the pre-test score was not used in any instance as the sole selection criterion. At least one and often as many as five additional variables were used as

supplemental criteria. Hence, the effect of regression error which is associated with the use of the pre-test score for selection was mitigated by the use of additional student selection criteria.

Useable reading test data were reported from five standardized test batteries on a total of 50,004 students. This figure represents 65.2 percent of the students in grades one through twelve who were enrolled in Title I reading activities. Of those students, 43,408 (86.8%) were tested with the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), the test battery which is used in South Carolina's Statewide Testing Program. The other test batteries from which useable data were reported are the California Achievement Tests (CAT), the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT), the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), and the SRA Achievement Series (SRA).

These data are summarized in Table V-1. For each test are given the number of students, the percentile rank (PR) of the mean of the pre-test standard scores, the PR of the post-test mean, the normal curve equivalents (NCEs) of the pre- and post-test PRs and the NCE gain from pre-test to post-test. Corresponding data are given for the aggregation across tests. Of course, the PRs for the total were converted from the weighted total NCEs, not vice versa. The data indicate positive significant gains for all tests except SRA, which shows a significant loss. Note, however, that only 123 students had scores derived from the SRA and this finding in the context of fifty thousand students is judged to be unrepresentative. The positive gains range from 6.9 NCEs to 1.9 NCEs. The overall average gain is 2.1 NCEs, a significant but educationally modest improvement.

Comparable mathematics test data are shown in Table V-2. The 39,562 students on whom these data are reported represent 69.2 percent of the students in grades one through twelve who were enrolled in Title I mathematics activities. The overall NCE gain of 2.3 is statistically significant

Table V-1

Norm-Referenced Model Achievement Data By Test
Total Reading

Test	Number of Students	Pre-test		Post-test		NCE Gain
		PR of Mean	NCE	PR of Mean	NCE	
CTBS	43,408	11.3	24.5	13.1	26.4	1.9***
CAT	2,040	11.8	25.1	13.8	27.1	2.0***
MAT	586	4.5	14.3	8.6	21.2	6.9***
SAT	3,847	13.4	26.7	16.4	29.4	2.7***
SRA	123	13.4	26.7	8.7	21.4	-5.3**
TOTAL	50,004	11.4	24.6	13.4	26.7	2.1***

Table V-2

Norm-Referenced Model Achievement Data By Test
Total Math

Test	Number of Students	Pre-test		Post-test		NCE Gain
		PR of Mean	NCE	PR of Mean	NCE	
CTBS	34,245	14.3	27.5	17.0	29.9	2.4***
CAT	1,623	10.3	23.4	13.1	26.4	3.0***
MAT	353	5.5	16.3	13.1	26.4	10.1***
SAT	3,214	15.1	28.3	17.1	30.0	1.7***
SRA	127	14.9	28.1	13.5	26.8	-1.3
TOTAL	39,562	14.1	27.3	16.6	29.6	2.3***

*Significant at less than .05

**Significant at less than .01

***Significant at less than .001

but, as was true for reading, educationally modest.

Table V-3 gives a grade by grade summary of the data aggregated from the five reading tests. The first nine grades show positive NCE gains. Of these, seven are statistically significant. Grade one shows an impressive 7.7 NCE gain; grade six shows a moderately impressive 3.8 gain; and grades four and seven show gains of 2.4 and 2.0, respectively. In the upper three grades, there are two negative gains, the one at grade ten being significant statistically but modest educationally.

Table V-4 gives a grade by grade summary of the data aggregated from the five mathematics tests. These findings are similar to those derived from the reading tests. Of the first nine grades, eight show positive gains, seven of which are statistically significant. Grade one, as was true in reading, shows an impressive gain of (6.6 NCEs). Grades four and six show moderately impressive gains of 4.5 and 3.8, respectively. Grade two shows a gain of 2.7 NCEs. The other gains were less than 2.0. In the upper three grades, all of the gains are negative, the one at grade ten being significant statistically but modest educationally.

The overall NCE gains for both reading and mathematics are statistically significant. The extent to which these gains are educationally significant is a matter of judgment. In reading, the percentile rank of the average of the pre-test scores is 11.4 and the post-test percentile rank is 13.4. In mathematics the corresponding values are 14.1 and 16.6. These increases of 2.0 and 2.5 percentile ranks are not large; but if similar gains were made by these children each year, over a ten year period the percentile ranks would increase to about 31 in reading and to about 39 in mathematics. Such an effect is hardly possible, however. Note that the pre-test percentile rank of each grade, except grades eleven and twelve in mathematics and grade eight in reading, is less than the post-test

Table V-3

Norm-Referenced Model Achievement Data By Grade
Total Reading

Grade	Number of Students	Pre-test		Post-test		NCE Gain
		PR of Mean	NCE	PR of Mean	NCE	
1	5,091	11.5	24.7	20.2	32.4	7.7***
2	6,461	17.4	30.3	18.1	30.8	.5
3	7,389	12.9	26.2	13.4	26.7	.5*
4	5,688	10.7	23.8	12.9	26.2	2.4***
5	6,318	11.4	24.6	12.3	25.6	1.0***
6	6,305	9.5	22.4	12.9	26.2	3.8***
7	4,287	9.9	22.9	11.7	24.9	2.0***
8	3,733	11.7	24.9	11.8	25.1	.2
9	2,183	8.7	21.4	9.8	22.8	1.4**
10	1,327	7.6	19.9	6.3	17.7	-2.2***
11	833	5.7	16.8	6.0	17.2	.4
12	389	4.0	13.1	3.5	11.9	-1.2
TOTAL	50,004	11.4	24.6	13.4	26.7	2.1***

Table V-4

Norm-Referenced Model Achievement Data By Grade
Total Math

Grade	Number of Students	Pre-test		Post-test		NCE Gain
		PR of Mean	NCE	PR of Mean	NCE	
1	4,173	14.8	28.0	23.2	34.6	6.6***
2	3,620	19.5	31.9	23.2	34.6	2.7***
3	5,519	16.2	29.2	16.3	29.3	.1
4	5,366	12.5	25.8	17.5	30.3	4.5***
5	6,378	15.1	28.3	14.9	28.1	-.2
6	6,000	13.0	26.3	17.2	30.1	3.8***
7	3,519	12.4	25.7	14.2	27.4	1.7***
8	2,600	12.5	25.8	14.2	27.4	1.6***
9	1,045	9.5	22.4	11.0	24.2	1.8**
10	1,054	9.9	22.9	8.3	20.8	-2.1**
11	218	8.6	21.3	8.6	21.2	-.1
12	70	9.3	22.1	7.5	19.7	-2.4
TOTAL	39,562	14.1	27.3	16.6	29.6	2.3***

*Significant at less than .05

**Significant at less than .01

***Significant at less than .001

percentile rank of the prior grade. This fact serves to confirm that the yearly selection process does identify the most educationally needy children; those who may have benefited most from the Title I service in a given year are probably the ones who are most likely to be replaced by children whose achievement theirs has grown to surpass. Hence, the children served each year in each grade may tend to be those for whom remediation is truly the most difficult. That the pre-test percentile ranks are as low as they are is evidence that South Carolina Title I programs are, indeed, serving educationally needy children. Hence, Title I programs may be self-defeating in their ability to show large, long-term, positive gains.

The data presented in this section of the report are based on a norm-referenced evaluation model. These data indicate that South Carolina students who are served by Title I reading and mathematics activities show statistically significant achievement gains. The educational significance of these gains might be debated; but considering the circumstances which were discussed above, the observed gains support the view that Title I activities have a positive effect upon student achievement.

Dropout Prevention

Although a causal relationship is difficult, if not impossible, to establish, student dropout rates are probably associated with school program quality. The dropout rate in South Carolina's schools has shown a decrease since the State Board of Education and The Department of Education placed a high priority on efforts to reduce the number of school dropouts. The observed decrease may have resulted in part from Title I dropout prevention activities.

The Department defines a dropout as a pupil who leaves a school without transferring to another school, for any reason, except death,

before graduation or before completion of a program. Local school districts which have Title I dropout prevention activities include dropout data as a part of their annual evaluation report to the Office of Federal Programs. During FY 1977, twenty-four of the ninety-two districts in South Carolina had Title I dropout activities in 60 schools. Of the 6,468 students involved in these activities, 274 or 4.2 percent dropped out during the year. In FY 1975, 5.7 percent, and in FY 1976, 4.7 percent of the students in such activities dropped out. In view of the fact that these programs serve only those students who are judged to be most likely to drop out of school and the fact that the state dropout rate has been approximately 1.2 percent for the last three years, the impact of these Title I activities is impressive, indeed.

VI. Community and Parental Involvement

The South Carolina Department of Education has always encouraged LEAs to involve parents and the community in the planning and operation of programs in the public schools. Title I has further encouraged the participation of the community as a whole in the development of programs to meet the needs of the educationally deprived child. In an effort to expand further the involvement of parents in Title I programs, the SEA included in the State Title I Manual, the federal regulations concerning parental involvement. Parent involvement on Title I parent advisory councils has increased significantly during the past four years, as follows: FY 1974, approximately 650; FY 1975, 3,208; FY 1976, 4,017; FY 1977, 4,234. Additionally, the Title I project application requires an assurance from the LEA representative. This assurance includes the following: (1) that the LEA has established a Title I Advisory Council in each Title I school in the district and also a districtwide Advisory Council, and (2) that a majority of each council consists of parents of children who are participating in Title I activities. The form further provides assurance from the districtwide PAC representative that the councils have been provided an opportunity to participate in planning, implementation, and evaluation activities.

The membership of PACs is summarized in Table VI-1. Note that by far the majority of the membership (81.2%) consists of parents of public school students who are participating in Title I activities.

The types of activities undertaken by the advisory councils are listed in Table VI-2. The most frequently occurring activities pertained to the planning, implementation and evaluation of the programs. Other activities, however, also occurred very often. Most notable among these

activities were reviewing and reacting to program proposals, contributing to publicity efforts, and soliciting the involvement of other parents. Assisting in the identification of student needs and acting as a hearing committee for suggestions to improve compensatory educational programs were activities in which well over one-half of the PACs participated. Table VI-3 shows that the PACs typically met fewer than seven times a year, but 56% of them report meeting at least five times during the year.

Table VI-1

Membership of Parent Advisory Councils

Representation	Number	Percent
Parents of public school participating students	3,437	81.2
Parents of non-public school participating students	78	1.8
Other	719	17.0

Table VI-2

Activities In Which The Parent Advisory Councils Participated

Activity	Number of Title I Councils Participating
Assist in the identification of students' needs	589
Participate in the planning of proposals	723
Review and react to program proposal prior to submission to state office	684
Act as hearing committee for suggestions to improve the compensatory education program	561
Participate in implementing the program	690
Aid in evaluating the program	692
Contribute to publicizing the program (dissemination)	673
Solicit involvement from other parents	643
Other	65

Table VI-3
Frequency of PAC Meetings

Intervals	Number of PAC Meetings
Monthly	139
7-11 times yearly	36
5-6 times yearly	230
Other	321

The State Department of Education has organized six regional Title I parent advisory councils. These regional councils consist of the chairman of each district PAC in the particular region along with selected district superintendents and Title I coordinators. A series of two in-service workshops was held in each region during the spring of 1976. The purposes of the workshops were to present to and provide for the PAC councils information and materials designed to assist in the implementation of local PAC activities and in making local PAC members more knowledgeable of several important Title I program functions. Sets of overhead transparencies and supportive materials were prepared and distributed to district PAC chairmen. The seven specific agenda items with which the workshops dealt were:

- (1) Overview of Title I
- (2) Target Area Selection
- (3) PAC Responsibilities
- (4) Needs Assessment
- (5) PAC and Other Parental Involvement
- (6) Evaluation
- (7) Dissemination

An evaluation of the workshops indicated a very favorable response from the participants. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of those responding to a questionnaire reported that their understanding of Title I and PAC responsibilities had been increased. Eighty-seven percent (87%) reported that they believed they could easily return to their districts and inform their local PACs about the issues. Ninety-eight percent (98%) reported that the transparencies and scripts with which they were provided for local use were adequate for the intended purpose.

In October, 1976, a follow-up questionnaire was mailed to each local district PAC chairman. Its purpose was to determine the problems and successes which had been experienced locally in conveying the information to the district PACs. The materials which had been prepared for local PAC use and which had been discussed and presented in the spring meetings had been designed to help to convey certain understandings about Title I programs. These twenty understandings were grouped and listed in the follow-up questionnaire. The respondents were to indicate whether or not the materials associated with each understanding were adequate for their purpose.

For twelve of the items more than 90% of the respondents indicated that the materials were adequate. For the other items between 84% and 89% indicated that the materials were adequate. These latter eight items became the agenda for regional PAC meetings which were held in May, 1977.

An evaluation form was returned by participants in the meetings. An average of 95% of the respondents indicated that the materials and presentations were adequate and understandable. No agenda item received fewer than 90% of the responses in the adequate category.

VII. Dissemination

Local Level

During FY 1977, local districts utilized a variety of techniques in disseminating pertinent information to the local community, the SEA and other agencies concerning the use of Title I funds. The advisory councils' activities were probably the most significant means of dissemination. (See Table VI-2) Other techniques are summarized in Table VII-1. Staff meetings and in-service workshops and seminars appear to be the most common ways of reaching staff members. Public meetings, open houses, PTA meetings and conducted tours were common ways in which laymen were contacted directly. News releases and feature stories were used by more than three-fourths of the districts as an indirect contact with the public. Approximately two-fifths of the districts utilized radio presentations. Only six districts received special television coverage, but this datum is tempered by the fact that only six cities in South Carolina have commercial television stations.

State Level

During the winter of each year, the Department sponsors an Education Fair. South Carolina education programs which have been judged to be effective are displayed in booths at the ED FAIR. Traditionally, some Title I activities have been included. The purpose of the event is to encourage local South Carolina school districts to adopt or adapt projects which may meet some of the educational needs of the districts.

Fourteen Title I activities which operated during FY 1976 were selected for inclusion in the fair which was held in February, 1977. Of these activities, eight were reading, five were mathematics, and one was a parental involvement activity. The thirteen instructional activities were selected on the basis of 1) showing reasonably consistent,

Table VII-1

LEA Techniques Used In Dissemination
Of Information and Frequency Of Use

Techniques and Methods Of Disseminating Information	Number Of Districts Using The Technique
1. Presentation of information and data in staff meetings	92
2. In-service training (workshops, seminars, etc.) conducted for Title I staff	92
3. Presentation of information and data in public meetings and community groups	80
4. News releases and feature stories in newspapers	72
5. PTA meetings	65
6. Open house	64
7. Newsletter to staff members	54
8. Conducted tours	49
9. Publications for local community distribution	46
10. Brochures or pamphlets	33
11. Presentation of information and data over the radio	28
12. Descriptive reports sent to other schools in state	23
13. Descriptive reports sent to Superintendents of Public Information	16
14. Special radio coverage of the project	9
15. Presentation of information and data over television	6
16. Publications for professional journals (for example, SCEA or NEA Magazines)	6
17. Special television coverage of project	6

significant gains across the grades served and 2) being viewed by the Title I supervisors in the Office of Federal Programs as being exemplary and replicatable.

Including the fourteen Title I activities, a total of forty projects were displayed at the fair. More than 800 persons signed the attendance register, and more than one-third of these people responded to an evaluation questionnaire. Among the items on the questionnaire, one asked each respondent to identify the project which was the most informative. Of the seven most often named projects, three were Title I activities.

Another item asked each respondent to indicate which project would most likely be of value if implemented in other districts. Of the three most often named projects, two were Title I activities.

Another item asked for an indication of the project which was most educationally worthwhile. The four most frequently named were all Title I projects.

As a follow-up to the ED FAIR, participants were invited to make site visits to the districts which had displayed projects at the fair. A total of sixty visits were made to seven of the thirteen Title I activities.

Ten Title I activities which operated during FY 1977 have been selected for inclusion in the fair which is to be held in February, 1978. Of these activities, two are first grade readiness, four are reading, and four are mathematics. The selection of these activities was accomplished by means of the following steps.

1. All reading, mathematics and readiness activities which showed significant achievement gains at one or more grade levels were selected for consideration.

2. A weighted average NCE gain was determined for each activity.
3. Each activity which showed an average NCE gain of 7.0 or more was identified.
4. Each of these activities was examined further by the Title I supervisors in the Office of Federal Programs. The purpose of this examination was to determine whether or not the components which comprised each activity appeared to be educationally exemplary and to have been designed in a manner which would make the activity replicatable in a meaningful manner in a significant number of districts.
5. Of the twenty-six activities which had shown NCE gains of 7.0 or more, ten were selected for invitation to the ED FAIR. Each of the ten districts involved has agreed to participate.

Publications which have received wide dissemination and which describe Title I activities that have been judged to be effective, based upon program evaluation data, are listed below:

ESEA Title I Programs That Work - This publication described the fourteen Title I activities which were exhibited in the South Carolina Education Fair which was held in February, 1977. Four hundred copies were printed and dissemination has included all local education agencies in South Carolina, each state and territory, as well as numerous interested individuals on a request basis.

SHARE - A collection of "promising programs" operated during the 1976-77 school year in South Carolina school districts are described in this publication of the S. C. Department of Education. One thousand copies of SHARE were printed, which contained one-hundred and eighty-eight (188) activities, operating in forty-eight (48) school districts. Twenty-six (26) Title I activities were included in the publication, which has been disseminated widely within the State.

VIII. Teacher/Teacher Aide Training

LEAs which included teacher aides in their project proposals were required to show evidence of coordinated in-service training programs with joint participation of the educational aides and the professional staff members. In addition, the training offered had to be related to the specific duties and responsibilities of involved staff members and aides.

The general pattern of such activities consisted primarily of meetings two to three days prior to the opening of school, and scheduled meetings either weekly or monthly during the school term. Most of the school districts' activities emphasized instructional material, equipment and techniques and the evaluation of instruction.

A total of \$192,645 of Title I funds was spent on pre-service and in-service combined, an average of \$2,094 per district. In addition, an estimated \$324,468 was spent from other sources. This figure includes a portion of the salaries of non-Title I supervisors and consultants who conducted training sessions. (See Table III-4)

IX. Compensatory Education For Children Enrolled In Non-Public Schools

During the school year of 1969-1970, the SEA made a concerted effort to enhance the participation of eligible non-public school children in the state. The major outgrowth of the effort made by the SEA was a revision of the assurances in Title I projects with regard to participation of eligible children in non-public schools, and proposed specific action to ensure improved assessment and adequate participation.

All districts in which eligible non-public schools are located have initiated a system of joint planning so that representatives of eligible non-public schools participate in the development of the Title I program. Participation of non-public school students in FY 1977 was 929, an increase of 28% over FY 1976. The majority of the non-public school programs were conducted during the regular school year on a regular time schedule.

X. State Educational Agency Technical Assistance Efforts

During FY 1977, twenty-two technical assistance workshops were conducted to inform the local administrative personnel involved in Title I of state and federal procedures germane to the successful and legal operation of their Title I programs. In addition to this effort, the Title I staff provided individual technical assistance to school districts upon request.

The workshops which were conducted during July 1976 to June 1977 are as follows:

1. September 21, 1976. Instructions for submitting Title I Tydings Amendments, Comparability Reports, and Handicapped 313 Reports.
2. March 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 1977. Title I Evaluation Technical Assistance Conferences.
3. March 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 1977. Regional Conferences conducted throughout the state to explain Title I pre-submission requirements.
4. May 11, 12, 17, 19, 24, 26, 1977. PAC Conferences to provide in-service training for district PAC chairpersons.
5. June 9, 1977. Conference to explain final application procedures for FY 1977 proposals and FY 1976 Annual Evaluation Report.
6. April-June, 1977. Coordinators, curriculum specialists and evaluators of each of the ninety-two school districts and six state agencies were scheduled for individual pre-submission conferences in order to review preliminary draft of FY 1978 proposal.

The materials and procedures used in the workshops were developed specifically for use in these workshops. An evaluation of the materials showed that they were effective in imparting information. Some of the proposals reviewed during the pre-submission conferences (No. 6 above) were already in fundable form. This fact is further evidence of the effectiveness of the technical assistance efforts.